

Serial No.: 09/744,586

REMARKS

Claims 8-12 and 29, as amended, remain herein. Claims 5-7, 13-28, 30, 33, 34, 36, 38-41 and 43-152 remain herein but are presently withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1-4, 35, 37 and 42 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim 8 has been amended to recite the polymer-dispersed liquid crystal layer also is for operating in a normally-white-mode at a white luminance level when a luminance level of the display element is set at a peak reflectivity value in voltage-reflectivity characteristics of the display element. See applicants' specification at page 55, line 21, through page 56, line 4. Claim 29 has been amended to recite said driving voltage range is a range in which the luminance decreases monotonously from a peak value. See applicants' specification at page 56, lines 2-4. Other minor editorial changes have been made in claims 8, 9, 12 and 29.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite specific usage temperatures. See applicants' specification at page 129, line 12.

Serial No.: 09/744,586

Claims 31 and 32 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

1. The corrected Office Action Summary transmitted to applicants' representative on February 12, 2004 acknowledges effective receipt of certified copies of all priority applications whose benefit is claimed in this application.

2. Claim 29 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 29 has been reworded, thereby mooting the rejection.

3. Claims 8-12, 29 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohmae et al. U.S. Patent 5,610,735 and Sadovnik U.S. Patent 5,764,317.

The presently claimed reflective liquid crystal display element comprises a polymer-dispersed liquid crystal layer for operating in a normally-white-mode at a white luminance level when a luminance level of the display element is set at a peak reflectivity value in voltage-reflectivity characteristics of

Serial No.: 09/744,586

the display element. This arrangement is nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

The Office Action cites Ohmae '735 as allegedly disclosing applicants' liquid crystal device, except for the polymer-dispersed liquid crystal layer have a scattering gain satisfying applicants' claimed relationship, and cites Sadovnik '317 as allegedly teaching same. However, neither Ohmae '735 nor Sadovnik '317 discloses or suggests a polymer-dispersed liquid crystal layer for operating in a normally-white-mode at a white luminance level when a luminance level of the display element is set at a peak reflectivity value in voltage-reflectivity characteristics of the display element, as recited in applicants' claim 1.

Neither Ohmae '735 nor Sadovnik '317 discloses or suggests that the peak reflectivity value of the presently claimed polymer-dispersed liquid crystal layer is correlated with the scattering gain (SG) of the polymer dispersed liquid crystal layer (as recited in applicants' claim 1), and that there is a range of optimum scattering gains for achieving an even larger peak value, as shown in applicants' Fig. 5.

Serial No.: 09/744,586

Neither Ohmae '735 nor Sadovnik '317 discloses or suggests the liquid crystal display element recited in claim 1, further comprising means for driving a voltage range of the electric field, wherein the driving voltage range is a range in which the luminance decreases monotonously from a peak value, as recited in applicants' claim 29.

For the foregoing reasons, neither Ohmae '735 nor Sadovnik '317 contains any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in either of these references that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claims 9-12 and 29, which depend from claim 8, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 8. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 09/744,586


All claims 8-12 and 29 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection stated in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 8-12 and 29 is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

April 7, 2004
Date


Roger W. Parkhurst
Registration No. 25,177
Robert N. Wieland
Registration No. 40,225

RWP:RNW/mhs

Attorney Docket No.: OGOH:063

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.
1421 Prince Street, Suite 210
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805
Telephone: (703) 739-0220